

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are the independent claims.

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lundberg et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,534. Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundberg in view of Osborne, U.S. Patent No. 6,078,733. Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lundberg in view of Osborne and further in view of Krishnan et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,922,416. Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundberg in view of Osborne and further in view of Krishnan et al. and Chow et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,052,387.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections**

#### **Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17 and 18 are Patentable Over the Prior Art**

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lundberg. It is noted that Lundberg was issued and published more than one year prior to the filing date of the present application.

According to the embodiments of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, a message sent from a local device to a remote device may identify the message as a type of remote Direct Memory Access read operation. If the remote device determines that that is the case, the remote device is then to perform a remote Direct Memory Access write operation to the local device. In some situations,

embodiments of the present invention provide an improved transfer of data between devices (e.g., in a network server system).

Claim 1, for example, recites: 1. Determining, at a remote device, whether the transport header of a message identifies the message as a remote Direct Memory Access (rDMA) read operation, and 2. performing a rDMA write operation at a local device in accordance with data elements included in the message, if the transport header of said message identifies the message as the rDMA read operation. These features are not described or suggested by the Lundberg reference.

Lundberg refers to a system for arbitrating packetized data from the network to the peripheral resources and prioritizing the dispatching of packets on the network. The Office Action cites several sections of Lundberg, but only one of those sections even mentions Direct Memory Access, Col. 1, lines 42-45. The complete sentence at that part of Lundberg states as follows, "Packets are taken from the network and the packet routing logic interprets the packet's header, directing the packet to one of a plurality of DMA channels, a maintenance channel, an express channel for very small data payloads, and message channels." This is simply stating that packets are routed to their appropriate channel based on the type of packet they are. The system of Lundberg insures non-DMA channel packets are given the high priority in the system (see Col. 1, lines 47-51).

There is no disclosure in Lundberg to determine if a message is identified as a rDMA read operation and performing a rDMA write operation in accordance with data elements included in the message as called for in the claims. Such terms are not even mentioned in Lundberg. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections**

**Claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-24 are Patentable Over the Prior Art**

As presented above, Lundberg fails to teach or suggest features of the independent claims. The Osborne, Krishnan and Chow references fail to make up for the deficiencies of Lundberg. Osborne refers to message processing. Contrary to the assertions made in the Office Action, there is no disclosure in the cited section of Osborne concerning the handling of rDMA read or write messages in a Virtual Interface or otherwise. It appears from the text of the Office Action that the Krishnan reference has been cited to show a last data segment and completion of a rDMA request and that Chow shows a last buffer bit. These three references taken individually or in combination with Lundberg fail to teach or suggest determining whether a message indicates a rDMA read operation and performing a rDMA write operation in accordance with data elements included in the message as called for in each of the pending claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-8, 11-16, and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Appl. No.: 09/397,850  
Amdt. dated February 16, 2005  
Response to an Office Action dated August 16, 2004

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present case is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance to that effect for all currently pending claims.


Applicants authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees determined to be due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4255 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: February 16, 2005

  
By: Shawn W. O'Dowd (Reg. No. 34,687)

1500 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 220-4200  
Fax: (202) 220-4201

DC01 542847v1